

NO MASSIVE BLACK HOLE IN CYG X-3

*Abhas Mitra*¹

Received _____; accepted _____

arXiv:astro-ph/9802124v1 11 Feb 1998

¹Theoretical Physics Division, Bhabha Atomic Research Center, Mumbai- 400 085, India

E-mail: nrl@magnum.barc.ernet.in

also krsrini@magnum.barc.ernet.in

ABSTRACT

There has been a recent suggestion that Cyg X-3 contains a black hole (BH) of mass $M_1 \sim 17M_\odot$. This interpretation is closely linked to a previous claim that Cyg X-3 contains a Wolf-Rayet star of mass $M_2 \sim 10M_\odot$. The latter interpretation would imply that the X-ray source in this close binary ($P = 4.8$ hr) is enshrouded by a relatively cool superstrong wind with $\dot{M} \geq 10^{-5} M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$. It can be shown that such a wind would be completely opaque to the low energy X-rays observed from the source and hence the Wolf-Rayet hypothesis can not be a correct one. By pursuing the same argument it also follows that the compact object must be of modest mass ruling out the existence of a massive BH in Cyg X-3. Note, however, that at present we can not strictly rule out the probable existence of stellar mass BH in Cyg X-3 or any other X-ray binary which are believed to contain a neutron star as the compact object. Yet, a more probable scenario for Cyg X-3 would be one where the compact object is a canonical neutron star (NS) and the companion is an extremely low mass dwarf, $M_2 \sim 10^{-2} M_\odot$ much like *PSR 1957 + 20*.

Subject headings: binaries: close -stars: individual: Cyg X-3

1. INTRODUCTION

In a recent paper, Schmutz, Geballe & Schild (1996, henceforth SGS) have claimed to have presented evidence for the existence of a $\sim 17 M_{\odot}$ BH in Cyg X-3. This conclusion is based primarily on the previous interpretation of van Kerkwijk et al. (1992, VK) that the companion of Cyg X-3 is a moderately massive Wolf-Rayet star of mass, $M_2 \sim 10 M_{\odot}$. SGS have claimed to have measured the value of the mass function of the binary as $f(m) = 2.3 M_{\odot}$ by using the numerical relationship

$$f(m) = 1.035 \times 10^{-7} K^3 P (1 - e^2)^{3/2} = \frac{M_1^3 \sin^3 i}{(M_1 + M_2)^2} \quad (1)$$

where P is the binary period in days, e is the eccentricity of the binary, i is the angle of inclination of the orbit, and K is the measured orbital Doppler velocity amplitude (in Km s^{-1}). SGS obtained $M_1 = 17 M_{\odot}$ by taking a value of $e = 0$, $P = 0.2$, $i = 50^\circ$, $K = 480 \pm 20 \text{ Km s}^{-1}$, and M_2 (Wolf-Rayet) = $13 M_{\odot}$. However, in a recent paper (Mitra 1996, henceforth M96), it has been discussed in considerable detail why this Wolf-Rayet interpretation is unlikely to be true for Cyg X-3. Furthermore, a careful scrutiny of SGS would reveal that the velocity amplitude measured by SGS may not be related to orbital motion at all. The former point alone would show that even if we take the quoted value of K , the compact object may not have a mass higher than $2.7 M_{\odot}$.

M96 attempted to show that had Cyg X-3 really contained a Wolf-Rayet star with a wind much stronger than $10^{-7} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, it would be opaque to low energy X-rays. And massive Wolf-Rayet stars have wind stronger than $\dot{M} \geq 10^{-5} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. Following the analytical work on photoionization opacities of a cosmic plasma by different authors, it was shown in M96 that for 2 – 8 keV X-rays passing through a wind, the photoelectric absorption cross-section approximately varies as $\sigma \sim 5 \times 10^{-22} (E/1 \text{ keV})^{-3} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ per H atom}$. Simultaneously the thick wind offers a very large column density (l) to the central

X-ray source which results in a very large absorption optical thickness $\tau \gg 1$ for the low energy X-rays.

However, there is a scope for confusion in this regard because Teresawa & Nakamura (1993) have claimed to have applied the CLOUDY photoionization code to the model of Cyg X-3 to find that the Wolf-Rayet wind need not be opaque to the X-rays. In M96, we discussed in detail why this claim can not be true. One of the reasons being that one can not conceive of a wind whose metallicity is lower than the basic cosmic composition; in fact, the wind of all evolved stars are likely to have metallicities much higher than the basic cosmic values. Correspondingly, the actual opacities of the W-R wind can be much higher than what has been estimated in M96. And it is important to note that the fact that a wind as strong as that of a Wolf-Rayet star, even if it were made of cosmic composition, would be absolutely opaque to soft X-rays for a close X-ray binary with $P = 4.8$ hr *has been verified independently by A.C. Fabian by making use of the same photoionization code CLOUDY* (M96). Since the resultant optical depths could be as large as $\sim 10^3$, probable uncertainties in such calculations would not change the basic conclusion that a Wolf-Rayet wind would be absolutely opaque to soft X-rays atleast for a close binary like Cyg X-3.

Nonetheless, in M96, it was assumed that the compact object has a mass $\sim 1.4M_\odot$ and let us try to adjudge the probable changes in the former interpretation in case the value of $(M_1 + M_2)$ were $\sim 30M_\odot$. Since the semimajor axis of the binary changes only modestly in this process, $a \sim (M_1 + M_2)^{1/3}$, the value of l is lowered approximately by a factor of three for a given value of $\dot{M}$ and mean wind speed v . On the other hand, the average value of the ionization parameter, ξ , (Tarter, Tucker & Salpeter 1969) remains approximately constant:

$$\xi = \frac{L_x}{nr_x^2} = \frac{4\pi v m r^2 L_x}{\dot{M} r_x^2} \quad (2)$$

where L_x is the X-ray luminosity, n is the atomic number density, r is the distance measured from the center of the companion and r_x is the distance measured from the center

of the compact object. For a mean value of $\frac{r}{r_x} \sim 1$, we can see that the value of ξ does not change significantly. In M96, the value of v was taken to be 1000 Km s^{-1} . Even if the value of v is higher, say, 2500 Km s^{-1} , for the extremely high value of $\dot{M} > 10^{-5} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ required by SGS, we would still have a low value of $\xi \sim 10^2$ as was originally found in M96.

Consequently, the value of the electron temperature of the wind continues to be very low $\sim 10^4 K$. Since, for a cosmic plasma, the previously referred value of the photoelectric absorption cross-section $\sigma \sim 5 \times 10^{-22} (E/1 \text{ keV})^{-3} \text{ cm}^2$ per H-atom holds good over a wide range of temperature $\sim 10^4 - 10^6 \text{ K}$, all that happens now is that the final optical depths would be reduced by a factor of $3 \times 2.5 \sim 7.5$. This means that if the claim of SGS were true, still we would have values of τ crudely ranging between $40 - 400$ depending on the value of i . Thus, the actual value of $\dot{M}$ must be much lower than what is implied by SGS. And simply this fact rather than any presumed value of M_1 would try to constrain the value of M_2 .

Therefore, we believe that the conclusion of M96 that $q \equiv M_2/M_1 \ll 1$ for Cyg X-3 remains valid for a wide range of values of M_1 and M_2 .

2. REANALYSIS

There are several implicit assumptions behind the philosophy of determining the mass function of a the companion(s) of a binary. One assumption is that the region from where the probe line or signal is emitted behaves like a point source and tracks the orbital motion. In otherwords the radial extent of the region $\Delta r \ll a$, the semimajor axis of the binary. This condition is approximately satisfied for optical lines emitted from the surface (photosphere) of even a massive star orbiting a wide binary ($P \gg 1 \text{ d}$), or for emission from a compact object like a neutron star in case of binary (radio) pulsars or X-ray binaries even when the

value of P is only a few hr. And if the IR lines observed by SGS really emanate from the surface of the companion in Cyg X-3, this condition might be valid. Even then, for $q \ll 1$, we obtain from equn. (1) $f(m) \sim M_1 \sin^3 i$. Note here that, so far, the best observational limit on the inclination angle is that due to White & Holt (1982) and which was obtained from the X-ray studies of Cyg X-3: $i \leq 70^\circ$. Therefore, a value of $f(m) = 2.3 M_\odot$ *could actually imply* $M_1 \approx 2.7 M_\odot$ *contrary to the estimate of SGS, $M_1 \approx 17 M_\odot$!* The compact object of Cyg X-3 is likely to be spinning rapidly and therefore a value of $M_1 \approx 2.7 M_\odot$ is well below upper mass limit of a similar neutron star ($\sim 3.8 M_\odot$) (Friedman & Ipser 1987). This range of a value of M_1 is in broad agreement with the general idea that the compact object in Cyg X-3 is radiating at a near Eddington rate (Mitra 1992a).

The above conclusion that $M_1 \sim 2.7 M_\odot$ has been reached by considering the interpretation of SGS that the measured velocity dispersion could be really ascribed to the orbital motion. However, following some clarification due to R. Gies (personal communication), now we point out that this very interpretation is unlikely to be true because of the following reasons. In their paper, SGS show a light curve in their Fig. 1 and a radial velocity curve in their Fig. 5. We see that the IR flux minimum (which must occur at an orbital conjunction phase) occurs at the same epoch as the radial velocity extremum, which, if it were, the result of orbital motion, must occur at a quadrature phase. Thus *it is unlikely that SGS have measured the orbital motion*. Instead, it appears much more probable that the features SGS have measured are related to the structures in the wind outflow. In fact, their light curve and line profiles resemble the models for wind outflow given by van Kerkwijk et al. (1996), and thus it seems extremely likely that the SGS velocity curve reflects changes in the orientation of structure in the wind and not orbital motion. Note also that in any case, the observed lines are supposed to be produced far off in the wind in a region which is relatively cool ($\Delta r \gg a$?). If this is true, the entire work of SGS is rendered irrelevant for the use of mass-function formula (1).

Let us remind here that if the companion is a He-rich dwarf, then strong X-ray irradiation due to the compact object may ablate the companion and generate an evaporative wind either from the companion or from the accretion disk or from both. And in such a case, we would not be hard put to explain how we can have a W-R star with a radius apparently larger than the narrow Roche lobe of Cyg X-3 as the mass donating star. Note also that this latter difficulty is usually explained away by assuming that the strong emission lines are emitted from a region much larger than the orbit size ($\Delta r \gg a$). If it were really so, again, we are led to the conclusion that the observations of SGS do not refer to the orbital motion at all.

3. CONCLUSION

We find that even if we take the measured value of SGS at its face ($K = 480 \pm 20$ km s⁻¹), the value of the mass of the compact object in Cyg X-3 could be as low as $2.7M_{\odot}$ and which invalidates the claim for finding evidence for a massive $\sim 17 M_{\odot}$ BH in Cyg X-3. However, it should be borne in mind, that in a strict sense, at present, one cannot absolutely rule out the existence of a *stellar mass* BH in Cyg X-3 or for that matter in most of the low mass X-ray binaries which are normally believed to contain a neutron star as the compact object. Yet more importantly, we find that the measurement of SGS may not at all be ascribed to orbital motions rendering it irrelevant for determination of the mass function(s) of the binary.

It may be worthwhile to recall the backdrop against which this idea of having a massive BH in Cyg X-3 arose; obviously it was the suggestion put forward by van Kerkwijk et al. (1992) that the detected He-lines in the infrared spectrum of Cyg X-3 could be due to a massive Wolf-Rayet star. Note, however, that, in the same paper, it was mentioned that

“Such a wind might be due X-ray irradiation of either the accretion disk or a low mass companion. *Alternatively*, it could be intrinsic to the companion, that is the companion could be a WR star. For lack of prediction, the irradiation models are extremely difficult to test. Below, we therefore confine ourselves to the WR model.”

Unfortunately, it did not take long to forgo the reasonableness expressed in the foregoing statement and many researchers took the more fashionable Wolf-Rayet hypothesis to be granted by completely ignoring the wind opacity problem. Once, we accept that the compact object is of modest mass and use the fact that $q \ll 1$, the analysis of M96 would strongly suggest the companion in this binary is a very low mass object $M_2 \sim 0.01M_\odot$ and, presumably, a He-rich white dwarf ablated in response to the bombardment of various radiations emanating from the compact object (Mitra 1992b). This given estimate would be in agreement with the idea that Cyg X-3 could be an immediate predecessor of a system like PRS 1957+20. Then the evolutionary status of Cyg X-3 suggested by the present work and M96 would be quite similar to the one discussed by Tavani, Ruderman, & Shaham (1989).

However, we must bear in mind that the evolutionary model of Cyg X-3 which has been suggested here or any other model suggested by other authors must be considered tentative at the present stage. Only when such models are developed further and it will be found that they are capable of reproducing the observed He and other line strengths, such models may be considered to be realistic ones.

Acknowledgement: The author wishes to thank R. Gies for illuminating discussions on several aspects of the present work.

REFERENCES

- Friedman, J.L.& Iser, J.R., 1987, ApJ 314, 59
- Mitra, A. 1992a, ApJ, 384, 255
- Mitra, A. 1992b, ApJ, 390, 345
- Mitra, A., 1996, MNRAS, 280, 953
- Schmutz, W., Geballe, T.R., & Schild, H. 1996, A & A 311, L25
- Tarter, C.B., Tucker, W.H. & Salpeter, E.E., 1969, ApJ 156, 943
- Tavani, M., Ruderman, M., & Shaham, J., 1989, ApJ 342, L31
- Teresawa, N. & Nakamura, H. 1993, MNRAS 265, L1
- van Kerkwijk, H.M., et al., 1992, Nature 355, 703
- van Kerkwijk, H.M. et al. 1996, A&A 314, 521
- White, N.E. & Holt S.S., 1982, ApJ, 257, 318